# Round 1 – Aff vs UMKC AB

## 1AC

### 1ac artaud redux

**Act One – The Violence Within**

**In the beginning was the language, and the language was gravity. Before the beginning was infinite violence. When violence met language, there was conflict; at once collision and collusion**. Conflict became a reproductive space of exchange, and atomisation became the original sin. We learnt what evil was, and it was the One.

Gravity meanwhile was inscribed into (celestial) bodies, becoming the first legal contract between them. So it is that particles collide to produce fragmented planets and people, in an exchange of violent energy. Humans similarly collide to exchange pleasantries, and sometimes bodily fluids. On the level of language, **morphemes collide to exchange ejaculations of speed and to reproduce meaning**. In the eighteenth century, these forms might have been approached through money, character and root.

Yet this beginning is simply the beginning of the rational, instinctual Man-form, and its subsequent trajectory through time and space. Following Nietzsche, **the universe** itself **is a monster of energy** without beginning, without end, not expanding but constantly transforming, **in an infinite play of forces**, and waves of forces **which work like concepts to create embodied affects. Violence is this monstrous energy**.

**The universe is** like the Hindu Trimurti, **a compound form of the eternally self creating Brahma, the mediating preserver, Vishnu, and the eternally self destroying Shiva**. It may otherwise be thought of in terms of the tripartite symbol of Aum, whose three letters represent the primordial vibration of the universe. Each letter corresponds to a state of existence, from the lower curve’s waking consciousness to the dream state’s suspended consciousness to the upper curve’s unconsciousness or deep sleep – A-U-M respectively. The spot meanwhile is the absolute consciousness that hovers over the semicircle of the maya, sometimes conceived as the illusion of duality. As humans we exist in this illusory fold of maya, which both preserves and reproduces our world through conflict. Unlike the equivalent violence, the spot does not collide with the other cosmic forces. And although illustrative, the symbol is no longer experienced in the absolute: matereality has killed it along with the gods.

**Our own material world is like an atomised pomegran(i)te, and we exist as six billion unitary seeds in it, bounded by State membranes**. At its core is a well of viscous rage; as with the Spanish term for pomegranate, granada, it holds explosive potential. Like the pomegranate, **it is in constant tension of cracking open, as tec(h)tonic plates and demographics create frictions and fictions alike**. **This world is fragile and Earth is a victim; sometimes it fights back through ‘natural’ disasters** like earthquakes and volcanic eruptions that reveal its innermost violent urges. **Global war-ming may be seen as the most advanced stage of this struggle, fought** not only through the Earth’s material fabric, but **through the atmosphere itself**.

**As humans within this world**,

we may meanwhile either ossify into institutions, or decompose into death, after which nothing happens.[[1]](#footnote-1)

**There is a certain thing above all** human **activity**:

**it is the example of this monotonous crucifixion, this crucifixion wherein the soul is forever being lost.**

**The cord which connects my intelligence, which preoccupies me, with the unconscious, which feeds me, reveals more and more subtle fibers at the heart of its tree-like tissue**.

And **it is a new life being born, a life which is more and more profound, eloquent, deep rooted.**

**Nothing precise can ever be reported by this soul which is strangling itself, for the torment which kills it, flays it fiber by fiber, takes place below the mind’s threshold, below the threshold of what language can say**; since the very connection (of what constitutes this soul and keeps it mentally together) is getting torn open little by little as life calls it toward unbroken lucidity. And there will never be lucidity concerning this passion, this kind of cyclical and fundamental martyrdom. And yet it does live, but its duration is here and there eclipsed, the fleeting keeps mingling with the fixed, and chaos with this incisive language of a lucidity without duration. This curse could be highly instructive for the depths it fills, but this world will never learn. [[2]](#footnote-2)

I have chosen the domain of sorrow and shadow as others have chosen that of the glow and the accumulation of things.

I do not labor within the scope of any domain.

My only domain is in eternity itself. [[3]](#footnote-3)

I learned yesterday

(I must be behind the times, or perhaps it's only a false rumor,

one of those pieces of spiteful gossip that are circulated between

sink and latrine at the hour when meals that have been ingurgitated

one more time are thrown in the slop buckets),

I learned yesterday

one of the most sensational of those official practices of American

public schools

which no doubt account for the fact that this country believes itself

to be in the vanguard of progress,

It seems that, among the examinations or tests required of a child

entering public school for the first time, there is the so-called

seminal fluid or sperm test,

which consists of asking this newly entering child for a small

amount of his sperm so it can be placed in a jar

and kept ready for any attempts at artificial insemination that

might later take place.

For Americans are finding more and more that they lack muscle

and children,

that is, not workers

but soldiers,

and they want at all costs and by every possible means to make

and manufacture soldiers

with a view to all the planetary wars which might later take place,

and which would be intended to demonstrate by the overwhelming

virtues of force

the superiority of American products,

and the fruits of American sweat in all fields of activity and of the

superiority of the possible dynamism of force.

Because one must produce,

one must by all possible means of activity replace nature

wherever it can be replaced,

one must find a major field of action for human inertia,

the worker must have something to keep him busy,

new fields of activity must be created,

in which we shall see at last the reign of all the fake manufactured

products,

of all **the vile synthetic substitutes**

in which **beatiful real nature has no part**,

and must give way finally and shamefully before all the victorious

substitute products

in which the sperm of all artificial insemination factories

will make a miracle

in order to produce armies and battleships.

No more fruit, no more trees, no more vegetables, no more plants

pharmaceutical or otherwise and consequently no more food,

but synthetic products to satiety,

amid the fumes,

amid the special humors of the atmosphere, on the particular axes

of atmospheres wrenched violently and synthetically from the

resistances of a nature which has known nothing of war except

fear.

And war is wonderful, isn't it?

For it's war, isn't it, that the Americans have been preparing for

and are preparing for this way step by step.

In order to defend this senseless manufacture from all competition

that could not fail to arise on all sides,

one must have soldiers, armies, airplanes, battleships,

hence this sperm

which it seems the governments of America have had the effrontery

to think of.

For we have more than one enemy

lying in wait for us, my son,

we, the born capitalists,

and among these enemies

Stalin's Russia

which also doesn't lack armed men.

All this is very well,

but I didn't know the Americans were such a warlike people.

In order to fight one must get shot at

and although I have seen many Americans at war

they always had huge armies of tanks, airplanes, battleships

that served as their shield.

I have seen machines fighting a lot

but only infinitely far

behind

them have I seen the men who directed them.

Rather than people who feed their horses, cattle, and mules the

last tons of real morphine they have left and replace it with

substitutes made of smoke,

I prefer the people who eat off the bare earth the delirium from

which they were born

I mean the Tarahumara

eating Peyote off the ground

while they are born,

and who kill the sun to establish the kingdom of black night,

and who smash the cross so that the spaces of spaces can never

again meet and cross.[[4]](#footnote-4)

If the truth can be told so as to be understood, it will be believed.

Human history represents such a radical break with the natural systems of biological organization that preceded it, that it must be the response to a kind of attractor, or dwell point that lies ahead in the temporal dimension. Persistently Western religions have integrated into their theologies the notion of a kind of end of the world, and I think that a lot of psychedelic experimentation sort of confirms this intuition, I mean, it isn't going to happen according to any of the scenarios of orthodox religion, but the basic intuition, that the universe seeks closure in a kind of omega point of transcendance, is confirmed, it's almost as though this object in hyperspace, glittering in hyperspace, throws off reflections of itself, which actually ricochet into the past, illuminating this mystic, inspiring that saint or visionary, and that out of these fragmentary glimpses of eternity we can build a kind of map, of not only the past of the universe, and the evolutionary egression into novelty, but a kind of map of the future, this is what shamanism is always been about, **a shaman is someone who has been to the end**, it's someone who knows how the world really works, and knowing how the world really works means to have risen **outside, above, beyond the dimensions of ordinary space, time, and casuistry, and actually seen the wiring under the board, stepped outside the confines of learned culture and learned and embedded language, into the domain of** what Wittgenstein called "**the unspeakable**," the transcendental presense of the other, which can be absanctioned, in various ways, **to yield systems of knowledge which can be brought back into ordinary social space for the good of the community**, so in the context of ninety percent of human culture, the shaman has been the agent of evolution, because the shaman learns the techniques to go between ordinary reality and the domain of the ideas, this higher dimensional continuum that is somehow parallel to us, available to us, and yet ordinarily occluded by cultural convention out of fear of the mystery I believe, and what shamans are, I believe, are people who have been able to de-condition themselves from the community's instinctual distrust of the mystery, and to go into it, to go into this bewildering higher dimension, and gain knowledge, recover the jewel lost at the beginning of time, to save souls, cure, commune with the ancestors and so forth and so on. **Shamanism is not a religion, it's a set of techniques, and the principal technique is the use of psychedelic plants**. What **psychedelics** do is they **dissolve boundaries, and in the presence of dissolved boundaries, one cannot continue to close one's eyes to the ruination of the earth, the poisoning of the seas, and the consequences of two thousand years of unchallenged dominator culture, based on monotheism, hatred of nature, suppression of the female, and so forth and soon**. So, what **shamans** have to do is **act as exemplars**, by making this cosmic journey to the domain of the Gaian ideas, and then bringing them back in the form of art to the struggle to save the world. The planet has a kind of intelligence, that it can actually open a channel of communication with an individual human being. **The message that nature sends is, transform your language through a synergy between electronic culture and the psychedelic imagination, a synergy between dance and idea, a synergy between understanding and intuition, and dissolve the boundaries that your culture has sanctioned between you, to become part of this Gaian supermind**, I mean I think it's fairly profound, it's fairly apocalyptic. History is ending. I mean, we are to be the generation that witnesses the revelation of the purpose of the cosmos. History is the shock wave of the eschaton. History is the shock wave of eschatology, and what this means for those of us who will live through this transition into hyperspace, is that we will be privileged to see the greatest release of compressed change probably since the birth of the universe. **The twentieth century is the shudder that announces the approaching cataracts of time over which our species and the destiny of this planet is about to be swept**. [[5]](#footnote-5)

What is most important, it seems to me, is not so much to defend a culture whose existence has never kept a man from going hungry, as to extract, from what is called culture, ideas whose compelling force is identical with that of hunger. We need to live first of all; to believe in what makes us live and that something *makes* us live-to believe that whatever is produced from the mysterious depths of ourselves need not forever haunt us as an exclusively digestive concern. I mean that if it is important for us to eat first of all, it is even more important for us not to waste in the sole concern for eating our simple power of being hungry. **If confusion is the sign of the times, I see at the root** of this confusion **a rupture between things and words, between things and the ideas and signs that are their representation**. Not, of course, for lack of **philosophical systems**; their **number and contradictions characterize** **our old** French and European **culture: but where can it be shown that life, our life, has ever been affected by these systems?** I will not say that philosophical systems must be applied directly and immediately: but of the following alternatives, one must be true: . Either these systems are within us and permeate our being to the point of supporting life itself (and if this is the case, what use are books?), or they do not permeate us and therefore do not have the capacity to support life (and in this case what does their disappearance matter?). **We must insist upon the idea of culture-in-action, of culture growing within us like a new organ, a sort of second breath**; and on civilization as an applied culture controlling even our subtlest actions, a presence of mind; the distinction between culture and civilization is an artificial one, providing two words to signify an identical function. A civilized man judges and is judged according to his behavior, but even the term "civilized" leads to confusion: **a cultivated "civilized" ~~man~~ is regarded as a person instructed in systems, a person who thinks in forms, signs, representations—a monster whose faculty of deriving thoughts from acts, instead of identifying acts with thoughts, is developed to an absurdity**. If our life lacks brimstone, Le., a constant magic, it is because we choose to observe our acts and lose ourselves in considerations of their imagined form instead of being impelled by their force. And this faculty is an exclusively human one. I would even say that it is this infection-of the human which contaminates ideas that should have remained divine; for far from believing that man invented the supernatural and the divine, I think it is ~~man~~'s age-old intervention which has ultimately corrupted the divine within him. **All our ideas about life must be revised in a period when nothing any longer adheres to life**; it is this painful cleavage which is responsible for the revenge of things; **the poetry which is no longer within us** and which we no longer succeed in finding in things **suddenly appears on their wrong side: consider the unprecedented number of crimes whose perverse gratuitousness is explained only by our powerlessness to take complete possession of life**. If the theater has been created as an outlet for our repressions, the agonized poetry expressed in its bizarre corruptions of the facts of life demonstrates that life's intensity is still intact and asks only to be better directed. But no matter how loudly we clamor for magic in our lives, we are really afraid of pursuing an existence entirely under its influence and sign. Hence our confirmed lack of culture is astonished by certain grandiose anomalies; for example, on an island without any contact with modem civilization, the mere passage of a ship carrying only healthy passengers may provoke the sudden outbreak of diseases unknown on that island but a specialty of nations like our own: shingles, influenza, grippe, rheumatism, sinusitis, polyneuritis, etc. Similarly, if we think Negroes smell bad, we are ignorant of the fact that anywhere but in Europe it is we whites who "smell bad." And I 'would even say that we give off an odor as white as the gathering of pus in an infected wound. As iron can be heated until it turns white, so it can be said that everything excessive is white; for Asiatics white has become the mark of extreme decomposition. This said, **we can begin to form an idea of culture, an idea which is first of all a protest. A protest against** the senseless constraint imposed upon the idea of culture by reducing it to a sort of inconceivable Pantheon, producing an idolatry no different from the **image worship** of those religions which relegate their gods to Pantheons**. A protest against the idea of culture as distinct from life** as if there were culture on one side and life on the other, as if true culture were not a refined means of understanding and exercising life. The library at Alexandria can be burnt down. There are forces above and beyond papyrus: we may temporarily be deprived of our ability to discover these forces, but their energy will not be suppressed. It is good that our excessive facilities are no longer available, that **forms fall into oblivion: a culture without space or time, restrained only by the capacity of our own nerves, will reappear with all the more energy**. It is right that **from time to time cataclysms occur which compel us to return to nature, i.e., to rediscover life**. The old totemism of animals, stones, objects capable of discharging thunderbolts, costumes impregnated with bestial essences-everything, in short, that might determine, disclose, and direct the secret forces of the universe-is for us a dead thing, from which we derive nothing but static and aesthetic profit, the profit of an audience, not of an actor.[[6]](#footnote-6)

Act Two – The Solar Theater

The Track of the sun

across the Sky

leaves its shining message,

Illuminating,

Strengthening,

Warming,

us who are here,

showing us we are not alone,

we are yet ALIVE!

And this fire......

Our fire.....

Shall not die[[7]](#footnote-7)

**This is not animism, any more than it is mechanism; rather, it is universal machinism**.

(Deleuze and Guattari, 1988: 283)

**Biomimetic innovation** is built on the detailed study of ‘existence proofs’ exhibited in animal physiology: an animal’s capacities are taken as evidence of an existing potential already designed and engineered to work in the world.4 It **proceeds by ‘reverse engineering’ the observable behaviors** expressed **in biological life**: without fully understanding an organism’s ‘design code’, **biomimeticists** attempt to **engineer machinic organisms or synthetic materials** capable of **expressing that animal’s functions**. An array of techniques and technologies – chemical engineering, robotic hardware, advanced computing technologies, and mathematical modeling software – are marshaled to enhance our own techno-abilities by remaking the capacities found in biological life.

Naturalists, ecologists, and evolutionary biologists historically presented an understanding of lobsters in relation to their ‘natural’ marine habitat, in connection to the organisms and the nonliving systems in which they live and to which they are related. In zoology textbooks, lobsters are situated next to their kin: pages on shrimp, crayfish, and other crustaceans surround those on the lobster (see, for example, Castro and Huber, 2005). Natural historians and ecologists place primacy on how lobster bodies emerged within an historical trajectory or how they relate to other bodies within a bounded ecological assemblage. Biomimicry, on the other hand, is unconcerned with the ‘place’ or the ‘natural’ order of the organism’s evolutionary development. Indeed, as a practice, it expresses little interest in where, when, and how lobsters emerged or in the crabs, clams, and shrimp related to them by networks of kinship or consumption. Instead, biomimetic scientists investigate lobster bodies for what they can do: how they orient themselves to the world and how such orientations are different from our own. Rather than being concerned with classification, **biomimeticists attend to the animal’s potential to connect with other forms of life, technologies, and social problems**, valuing lobsters for their capacity to move with agility and track chemicals underwater.

Biomimicry’s transformative potential is seductive; it is easy to fixate on how and where biomimetics shifts our conceptions of ‘life’. One may be (as I was) drawn to the ways in which biomimicry is Spinozan or Deleuzian in its attention to embodied capacities and its drive to appropriate them in bodies elsewhere. Machines that become lobsters or lobsters that become machines are not, as they say, associated by ‘mere metaphor’. These animals, their traits, and the products developed with knowledge of them are not valorized on account of animal symbolisms or the meanings attributed to their animality (as in Nicole Shukin’s work). Rather, **these animals become valued because of their functionality, efficiency, and ‘natural’ talents**. Biomimicry breaks down bodies the barriers: animal and machine become indistinguishable as the capacities of one are substituted for another. A lobster on a treadmill is a lobster defined by its ‘intensive’ functions – what its neuroethology can do and how it does it. Indeed, the animals that inspire biomimetic design may be best understood as ‘composition[s] of speeds and affects on the plane of consistency: a plan(e), a program, or rather a diagram, a problem, a question-machine’ (Deleuze and Guattari, 1988: 258). This biological apparatus thus can be read as a set of ‘intensive parts’: powerful and embodied capacities for action that are transferable from one body to another to solve any barrier to movement as the need – or question – arises. Read in this way, biomimetic practices are perhaps less ‘post-human’ than post-animal or post-species altogether.5

Supporters of the so-called biomimetic movement have billed it a ‘revolution’ in technoscientific innovation. But what kind of revolution is this? What are we to make of these rearrangements of biology and technology? Do lobsters and their robotic counterparts merely offer a vivid illustration of Deleuze and Guattari’s machinic assemblage of bodies and relations of moving parts? Or is there something more potent – politically, ethically, socially – to be expected from biomimicry’s techno-biologies? Advocates of biomimicry would have us think as much. So too would much of the existing literature in ‘post-humanism’ and animal studies.

**Historical traditions founded on a purified category of ‘the human’ absorb the blame for many of the problems characteristic of our contemporary global situation**. Giorgio Agamben’s figuration of ‘bare life’ encapsulates this argument in what are perhaps the starkest of terms. A life is rendered ‘bare’ when it subject to exclusion from the protections provided by law or social securities: the taking or neglect of ‘bare life’ requires no accountability. Agamben argues that such a state is predicated on the philosophical distinction between human and animal, a distinction that allows for the subsequent attribution of ‘animal’ qualities to the lives of humans. As inferior to but resident within ‘the human’, category of ‘the animal’ legitimizes the labeling of populations as ‘unfit’ for life in the polis, be they excluded on the basis of race, religion ethnicity, gender, class, or geographical origins (Agamben, 2004). In The Open, Agamben explores the history of science and philosophy that articulates this process of categorization as a legitimation of exclusion. He names this process the ‘anthropological machine’. Following this logic, Kelly Oliver notes that the human and animal, distinguished as such, serve as the founding concepts that ground acts of injustice and cruelty to humans as well all other species: ‘the anthropological machine… produces the monstrous category “animal” that not only effaces nearly infinite differences between species but also corrals them all into the same abject and inferior pen’ (Oliver, 2007: 11).

Similarly, but from within a more materialist tradition, Donna Haraway’s Cyborg Manifesto catalyzed a conversation that has located the negative qualities of science and politics in the ‘Western’ tradition – ‘racist, male-dominant capitalism; the tradition of progress; the tradition of the appropriation of nature as resource for the productions of culture; the tradition of reproduction of the self from the reflections of the other’ – within origin myths of purity and the maintenance of a ‘border war’ a between organisms and machines as well as humans and animals (Haraway, 1991: 150). The appointed ‘guru’ of the biomimetic movement and recent recipient of the UN’s ‘Champion of the Earth’ award in Science and Innovation, Janine Benyus, has composed a narrative of the our ecological crisis and its associated injustices that resonates with both Agamben and Haraway’s work. She locates our collective crisis on Earth in the ‘severed’ connection between humans and the Earth. As in Agamben’s narrative, this loss of connection is the result of an originary rupture, located in this instance with the agricultural revolution. We have lost, she laments, ‘cooking fires to storytell around [and] ceremonial dances to reenact the movement of the herds’ (Benyus, 1997: 183). But, for Benyus, historical progress has been one of a continual series of such ruptures, each inaugurated by technological development, and each leading humans further from what Benyus refers to as ‘our home’. The following is her version of the historical narrative:

Our journey began ten thousand years ago with the Agricultural Revolution, when we broke free from the vicissitudes of hunting and gathering and learned to stock our own pantries. It accelerated with the Scientific Revolution, when we learned, in Francis Bacon’s words, to ‘torture nature for her secrets.’ Finally when the afterburners of the Industrial Revolution kicked in, machines replaced muscles and we learned to rock the world. But these revolutions were only a warm-up for our real break from Earthy orbit – the Petro-chemical and Genetic Engineering Revolutions. Now that we can synthesize what we need and arrange the genetic alphabet to our liking, we have gained what we think of as autonomy. Strapped to our juggernaut of technology, we fancy ourselves as gods, very far from home indeed. (ibid)

Benyus’s history of our collective loss of connection to the earth is a story of compounding catastrophe that calls to mind Walter Benjamin’s Angelus Novus, who ‘sees one single catastrophe, which keeps piling wreckage upon wreckage and hurls it at his feet’ (Benjamin, 1996: 392).

3. Remaking life, remaking the human

Life creates the conditions conducive to life. (Benyus, 2002)

For Benyus as for Agamben, salvaging a saner life from the wreckage of history seems to require somehow absolving ourselves of ‘original’ catastrophe by rearticulating the human (and animal) differently. Indeed, like all of the aforementioned **theorists**, Benyus **calls for dismantling conceptions of human exceptionalism that seems** to have become **increasingly sedimented** throughout **history as** the ‘**wreckage’ is piled higher and higher**. For Agamben – as well as Kelly Oliver and Cary Wolfe – **this requires the destabilization** or even erasure **of the categories of human and animal through the recognition of shared limits, vulnerability, or an embrace of** Derrida’s ‘**nonpower at the heart of power’**. Haraway, along with Bruno Latour, Michel Serres, Sarah Whatmore, and Jane Bennett, attempts to rework the ‘human’ in practice, by writing of bodies-inrelation – bodies that have ‘never been human’ in spite of the centuries of philosophical and political writings that seem to assure the contrary. These writers enliven alternative histories, citing empirical evidence of our becomings with objects, animals, and bacteria and telling stories in which ‘the human’ is neither the protagonist nor even an active agent. Like the work of Deleuze and Guattari, these histories are meant to transform how we envision our own life activity. Together these authors all suggest that **we** not only recognize and acknowledge, but also **actively practice ever-changing ‘strange kinships’** that ‘[allow] for an intimate relation based on shared embodiment without denying differences between life-styles or styles of being’ (Oliver, 2007: 18); **we are encouraged to reproduce life as if we were accountable for the entire ‘universal machine’ rather than the individuals and groups** (some, although not others) who we have selected out of it. For Haraway, **this consists of ‘retying the knots of multi-specied living on earth’** (Haraway, 2008: 2) **and better attending to the ‘sym-bio-genesis’ of all beings by recognizing that they are “the fruit of ‘the co-opting of strangers, the involvement and infolding of others into ever more complex and miscegenous genome**”’ (Margulis and Sagen, quoted in Haraway, 2008: 31). Accordingly, such transformations in how we practice everyday life and how we imagine our own subjectivities offer the potential to enact ‘autre-mondializations’ – alternative global political arrangements divorced from neoliberalism and liberal humanism (Haraway, 2008).[[8]](#footnote-8)

## 2AC

### 2ac race

#### Only adding plan can solve their alternative because it adds friction which results in mutual action, this embraces tension as a means of coalition building—even if they’re mutually exclusive that’s just solvency for the perm.

Adams, ’02– Assistant Professor of English at University of Tulsa (Katherine, Hypatia, At the Table with Arendt: Toward a Self-Interested Practice of Coalition Discourse, Muse)

As Anzaldúa and Friedman both point out, the desire to move "beyond difference" is essential to coalition building. Yet it also threatens to pull us free from the materiality of bodies and their contexts and histories, and gestures toward a place where difference disappears altogether. Friedman's reminder of the "materialist and historicist" facts of life exerts a kind of counter pull against that utopian movement. I wonder, however, if such cautionaries recondition the utopian urges of discourse, or if they instead establish a polarity, so that the negotiation among political actors veers between the poles of materiality and discourse, difference and sameness, crisis and utopia, tracing a kind of frustrated dialectic that never generates its synthesis. Here I will argue that within "self-interested" discourse, difference and sameness can act mutually within one syntax, one grammar--not taking turns as the subjects of contradictory sentences that must displace each other in order to make meaning. Focus on the material bases of difference need not become deterministic, nor does it preclude an exploration of what Friedman calls "the contact zone." Rather, a "self-interested" engagement with materiality can provide the very basis of expressing and activating complex identity. It can disrupt the static binary logic of difference and sameness in the way Friedman describes, while keeping the two in tension with each other. It can engage material context without suppressing the flexibility, fluidity, and multiplicity of complex identity, thus allowing difference to be more fully considered but not hypostatized--the illusion of a priori difference disappearing along with that of a priori selfhood. Thus, it helps to center the areas of contact and commonality in order to effect alliance and transformation. To demonstrate how this can be, I will next outline a theoretical model of self-interest, drawing upon the notion of "inter-est" that Hannah Arendt outlines in her masterwork, *The Human Condition* (1958), and considering its application to coalition discourse. Following that, I offer a more concrete approach to what self-interested coalition discourse might actually sound like, by examining a widely known demonstration of complex identity, Minnie Bruce Pratt's essay "Identity: Skin Blood Heart" (1984). The first part of this discussion concerns how a more self-interested approach would provide what seems crucially missing in Pratt's effort to transform difference and privilege. I conclude, however, by looking within Pratt's essay for a glimpse of self-interested discourse at work.

#### Voting negative means refusing a politics of representation. Reject the 1AC for their claims to represent oppressed peoples in the debate space in favor of a disidentification with the apparatuses of power/knowledge that police identity. Our alternative begs the question of how real political change begins and is a prior question to the 1AC method

Tsianos et al. ‘8 Vassilis, teaches sociology at the University of Hamburg, Germany, Dimitris Papadopoulos teaches social theory at Cardiff University, Niamh Stephenson teaches social science at the University of New South Wales. “Escape Routes: Control and Subversion in the 21st Century” Pluto Press

To escape policing and start doing politics necessitates dis-identi- fication - the refusal of assigned, proper places for participation in society. As indicated earlier, escape functions not as a form of exile, nor as mere opposition or protest, but as an interval which interrupts everyday policing (Ranciere, 1998). Political disputes - as distinct from disputes over policing - are not concerned with rights or repre­sentation or with the construction of a majoritarian position in the political arena. They are not even disputes over the terms of inclusion or the features of a minority. They occur prior to inclusion, beyond the terms of the double-R axiom, beyond the majority-minority duality. They are disputes over the existence of those who have no part (and in this sense they are disputes about justice in a Benjaminian sense of the word, Benjamin, 1996a). Politics arises from the emergence of the miscounted, the imperceptible, those who have no place within the normalising organisation of the social realm. The refusal of represen­tation is a way of introducing the part which is outside of policing, which is not a part of community, which is neither a minority nor intends to be included within the majority. Outside politics is the way to escape the controlling and repressive force of contemporary politics (that is of contemporary policing); or else it is a way to change our senses, our habits, our practices in order to experiment together with those who have no part, instead of attempting to include them into the current regime of control.This emergence fractures normalising, police logic. It refigures the perceptible, not so that others can finally recognise one's proper place in the social order, but to make evident the incommensurability of worlds, the incommensurability of an existing distribution of bodies and subjectivities with the principle of equality. Politics is a refusal of representation. Politics happens beyond, before representation. Outside politics is the materialisation of the attempt to occupy this space outside the controlling force of becoming majoritarian through the process of representation. If we return to our initial question of how people contest control, then we can say that when regimes of control encounter escape they instigate processes of naming and representation. They attempt to reinsert escaping subjectivities into the subject-form. Outside politics arises as people attempt to evade the imposition of control through their subsumption into the subject-form. This is not an attempt simply to move against or to negate representation. Nor is it a matter of introducing pure potential and imagination in reaction to the constraining power of control. Rather, escape is a constructive and creative movement - it is a literal, material, embodied movement towards something which cannot be named, towards something which is fictional. Escape is simultaneously in the heart of social transformation and outside of it. Escape is always here because it is non-literal, witty and hopeful.

#### We are in the midst of ecological crisis stemming from the way we treat one-another --- our aff is a critique of the culture that denies a voice to those with a beating heart and living politics

**Cone 2k** (James H., Briggs Distinguished Professor at Union Theological Seminary, “Whose Earth Is It Anyway?”, Cross Currents, Spring/Summer, Vol. 50 Issue 1-2, http://web.archive.org/web/20110518031005/http://www.crosscurrents.org/cone.htm)

Expanding the Ecological Critique. We are indebted to ecologists in all fields and areas of human endeavor for sounding the alarm about the earth's distress. They have been so effective in raising ecological awareness that few people deny that our planet is in deep trouble. For the first time in history, **humankind has the knowledge and power to destroy all life** -- either with a nuclear bang or a gradual poisoning of the land, air, and sea.

Scientists have warned us of the dire consequences of what human beings are doing to the environment. Theologians and ethicists have raised the moral and religious issues. Grassroots activists in many communities are organizing to stop the killing of nature and its creatures. Politicians are paying attention to people's concern for a clean, safe environment. "It is not so much a question of whether the lion will one day lie down with the lamb," writes Alice Walker, "but **whether human beings will ever be able to lie down with any creature or being at all**."(20)

What is absent from much of the talk about the environment in First World countries is a truly radical critique of the culture most responsible for the ecological crisis. This is especially true among white ethicists and theologians in the U.S. In most of the essays and books I have read, there is hardly a hint that perhaps whites could learn something of how we got into this ecological mess from those who have been the victims of white world supremacy. White ethicists and theologians sometimes refer to the disproportionate impact of hazardous waste on blacks and other people of color in the U.S. and Third World and even cite an author or two, here and there throughout the development of their discourse on ecology. They often include a token black or Indian in anthologies on ecotheology, ecojustice, and ecofeminism. It is "political correct" to demonstrate a knowledge of and concern for people of color in progressive theological circles. But people of color are not treated seriously, that is, as if they have something essential to contribute to the conversation. Environmental justice concerns of poor people of color hardly ever merit serious attention, not to mention organized resistance. How can we create a genuinely mutual ecological dialogue between whites and people of color if one party acts as if they have all the power and knowledge?

Since Earth Day in 1970, the environmental movement has grown into a formidable force in American society and ecological reflections on the earth have become a dominant voice in religion, influencing all disciplines. It is important to ask, however, whose problems define the priorities of the environmental movement? Whose suffering claims its attention? "Do environmentalists care about poor people?"(21) Environmentalists usually respond something like Rafe Pomerance puts it: "A substantial element of our agenda has related to improving the environment for everybody."(22) Others tell a different story. Former Assistant Secretary of Interior James Joseph says that "environmentalists tend to focus on those issues that provide recreative outlets instead of issues that focus on equity." Black activist Cliff Boxley speaks even more bluntly, labeling the priorities of environmentalists as "green bigotry." "Conservationists are more interested in saving the habitats of birds than in the construction of low-income housing."(23)

Do we have any reason to believe that the culture most responsible for the ecological crisis will also provide the moral and intellectual resources for the earth's liberation? White ethicists and theologians apparently think so, since so much of their discourse about theology and the earth is just talk among themselves. But I have a deep suspicion about the theological and ethical values of white culture and religion. For five hundred years **whites have acted as if they owned the world's resources** and have **forced people of color to accept their scientific and ethical values**. People of color have studied dominant theologies and ethics because our physical and spiritual survival partly depended on it. Now that humanity has reached the possibility of extinction, one would think that a critical assessment of how we got to where we are would be the next step for sensitive and caring theologians of the earth. While there is some radical questioning along these lines, it has not been persistent or challenging enough to compel whites to look outside of their dominating culture for ethical and cultural resources for the earth's salvation. One can still earn a doctorate degree in ethics and theology at American seminaries, even at Union Seminary in New York, and not seriously engage racism in this society and the world. If we save the planet and have a society of inequality, we wouldn't have saved much.

**Biomimetics is a paradigm which makes status quo relationships of domination and control untenable**

**Johnson, 10** – received her PhD from the University of Minnesota for doctoral work that focused on the political and social implications of “biomimicry,” an emerging field within which scientists reverse engineer biological traits for technological production (Elizabeth R. Johnson, *Reinventing biological life, reinventing ‘the human’*, Ephemera Journal volume 10(2): 177-193)

Janine Benyus’s work and that of the biomimeticists with which she is associated seem to follow through on these recommendations in practice. While less Continental philosophy than New Age, Benyus’s 1997 book, Biomimicry: Innovation Inspired by Nature, describes a collection of projects that suture together the now existing pieces of our historical ‘wreckage’ with the products of biological histories. The ultimate aim is to remake how we make technologies by modeling them on biological structures and functions. Rather than blindly push forward with a vision of technological ‘progress’ whose outcomes are unknown, we can look to nature to identify how it creates the conditions for life’s expansion. As she explains:

Evolution itself is believed to have occurred in fits and starts, plateauing for millions of years and then **leaping to a whole new level of creativity after crises**… my hope is that we’ll have turned this juggernaut around, and instead of fleeing the Earth, we’ll be homeward bound, letting nature lead us to our landing, as the orchid leads the bee. (Benyus, 1997: 5)

This is not all, however, as according to Benyus, engineering a future that is both ‘calm’ and sustainable requires more than the technological fix that biomimicry promises. Rather, it also requires fixing what we broke in the Agricultural Revolution in her narrative: our connection to the earth. And this, she suggests, is the ultimate promise of biomimicry – that it will undermine the conceptions of human and nonhuman life upon which the traditions of technological production and progress were built.

Print and online news media outlets view biomimetic productions with a sense of profound irony: journalists approach the idea that scientists at elite institutions and engineers at multinational corporations are looking to ‘lowly creatures’ to teach them how to overcome technological and conceptual roadblocks with humor (Gaidos, 2010: 22; Stresing, 2003). Benyus, however, foregrounds the potential for biomimicry to unsettle our notions of human exceptionalism as its most profound contribution. Rejecting a human-environment relationship best characterized by extraction, exploitation, and domination, Benyus characterizes biomimicry as a means of production founded on mutual enhancement and education: it’s not ‘what we can extract from nature, but ... what we can learn from her’ (Benyus, 1997: 2, emphasis in original). For her, biomimetic production is not about using animal life (or using it up), but about exploring it as a source of enchantment and inspiration. And, for Benyus, this is the true hope of biomimicry: that they will engender a more respectful, responsible, and humble engagement with nonhuman as well as human life.

When we view nature as a source of ideas instead of goods, **the rationale for protecting wild species and their habitats becomes self-evident**. To have more people realize this is my fondest hope. In the end, I think biomimicry’s greatest legacy will be more than a stronger fiber or a new drug. It will be **gratitude, and** from this, **an ardent desire to protect the genius that surrounds us**. (Benyus, 2008)

By transforming how we make everything from plumbing pipes to robots, Benyus argues that biomimicry naturally stretches the categories of human and nonhuman beyond their limits, shaking the foundation of human exceptionalism and forging more collaborative engagements with nonhumans for a more democratic and sustainable future. If we accept these conclusions, such engagements not only promise to solve our ecological crisis, but also the problematic social and political conditions that have led to it. Just as biomimicry disintegrates what we know of ‘lobsters’, Benyus and other advocates promise that it will break apart the human, locating it elsewhere, outside of itself in such a way that it can no longer refer back to an essential identity or reproduce an idealized image of human nature. Read through this lens, biomimicry might suggest an end to the ‘lethal and bloody’ operation of the ‘anthropological machine’ through a re-making of production and the reconsideration of the how humans, animals, and other things come together to produce things and, subsequently, to produce the world. Its practice of transgressing traditions borders and its emphasis on inspiration over appropriation seem to offer a **foundation for modes of production that are more ethical**, more attentive to and responsible for the bodies with which we produce. In Benyus’s words, ‘We will have to climb down from our pedestal and begin to see ourselves as simply a species among species, as one vote in a parliament of 30 million. When we accept this fact, we start to realize that what is good for the living Earth is good for us as well’ (ibid).

#### Our aff is a demand for recognition of our embeddedness within the biosphere – this is direct challenge to the pathological insecurity, which ensures the powerful will always resist changes

**Williams, 98** (Melvin, *Race for Theory and the Biophobia Hypothesis*, p. 9-15)

We will become global citizens in a global village. In our interdependent world, relationships with “others” pose urgent social problems as long as we participate in supremacy narratives and performances. We live on a poisoned and overpopulated planet where the respect for the web-of-life and ecosystems cannot compete with an emerging **pathological human insecurity**. An alternative human value system of embodies and ecosystem can set the human stage for peace on Earth.

The origin and evolution of human culture appear to be accompanied by some persistent values and attitudes that have eventually allowed humans to dominate and endanger Earth. Thus these once adaptive propensities have become maladaptive in the global village. I argue that these same propensities create social conflict and divisiveness. Humans can transform the human **values and attitudes that are the basis for these behaviors**; they can begin with the children. My volume describes new values that will position humans within the web-of-life, make them components of Earth, allow them to perceive all forms of life as vital parts of the living community, and permit them to eradicate the production and reproduction of social inferiority. Humans eat Earth and deposit their waste there as all other forms of life. We can respect life to the extent of banishing the myths of inequality.

I revisit Erving Goffman to appreciate the nature of supremacy performances in human behavior. Both Freud and Alfred Adler will reinforce that appreciation. If a million years of adaptable human behavior is to be altered, there must be a suitable costume, stage, and script for the future human performances. If the anthropologist Leslie White is accurate, and human culture is significantly autonomous, then there needs to be a description fo the global conditions and the industrial. Darwin provides the raw material to launch our discussions, and cognitive anthropologists will guide our efforts in the socialization of children for a new world order—the rational reconstruction of society.

Ecosystems, education, and human culture are examined together to socialize and educate humans for the next century, for the next stage in social development in the global village. Humans will begin to perceive themselves as being part of Earth rather than living on it. During this period, “**ecosophy” may become one of our most important disciplines**.

Human efforts to control their environments (including arbitrarily identified populations), and to control most forms of life within those environments, have allowed humans to adapt, multiply and spread over Earth. Now our efforts will be to understand our impact and to transform those outdated values and attitudes. We have devoted many of our resources to attempt to change human habits that are harmful to our ecosystems, but I argue that we will also transform the nature of human culture itself. That culture that has allowed us to master our environments will be altered to protect them.

This book presents a social science approach that creates an understanding of the social dimension of renewable natural resource management problems and of the dissemination of research findings, and that creates efforts for the promotion of a conservation ethic that will precede the cultural explosion—the Ecological Revolution. That description will be facilitated by the historical records of the cultural revolutions, both the agricultural

and the idea of sustainable development at global, regional, national, and local levels. I develop a vision of human attitudes and values that sustain those ecosystems—a new moral order. A major component of that vision is to identify attitudes and values that enable people to comprehend and accept the necessity for conserving and protecting the world’s biological diversity and to create technology and public policy that will support these efforts.

Policy studies, conservation ethics, human rights, and new technology, for effective biological diversity and conservation requires a new human culture. That culture will eliminate social identity dependency on class, race, ethnicity, gender, religion, age, nation, and species. These new global citizens will be committed to the protection of our ecosystem, including our children, our aged, our poor, and our ill. The social commitment will be one that combines the education of parents, educators, policymakers, and industrial and military managers with the socialization of children to view the world’s ecosystems and its biological diversity as crucial parts of human life and health itself.

Adaptive cultural evolution now emerges with a **dangerous cultural lag**—attitudes and values that are **not compatible with present levels of science, weaponry, and technology**. This book examines value and attitude transformations and determines how new worldviews about ecology and human populations can be formulated and channeled into action: global change, curriculum development, interdisciplinary course, and state, local, regional, and global leadership training. This effort presents a new balance to the positivist-deconstructionist antagonisms. It creates some common research interests and new working relationships among the humanities and the social and natural sciences. WE may finally be able to understand race and cressans as supremacy narratives and performances.

Macroanthropology: Discovering Unity in the Search for Ourselves

The greater our knowledge of how man arose and how he functions, how he has developed and is developing the culture which makes him human, the greater our chance of using such knowledge in the culture process of which it becomes a part. With every increase in awareness and in our ability to articulate new social concepts which the scientific study of man makes possible, we become different human beings because our stature is enhanced by the culture we share. (Mead 1960b: 341)

Cultural anthropology can be dynamic and effective in its postcentennial period in America and in the twenty-first century in the world. The discipline can utilize all of its fields—practice, ethnology, archaeology, biology, and linguistics—to help make the world safe for humanity. If we continue to search for human nature, focus on the panhuman dilemmas of our times (see Williams 1992b), and help to sustain the ecosystems of the global village, we will learn to comprehend the human search for security. The privileged primate (humans) will deconstruct their delusions of superiority, determine the biophobia hypothesis (Williams 1992b: 192), and to welcome an Ecological Revolution. I call approach macroanthropology in order to recognize our kinship with the other social sciences that have used similar terms.

Within the context of a macrotheoretical approach to humans and to ecosystems, this book explores the social and environmental violence of humans be means of the biophobia hypothesis. The intractable destruction of Earth, including human communities, can be explored in terms of the origin, nature, and development of the human species itself. I discuss some aspects of that destruction (e.g., classism, racism, ethnocentrism, sexism, sectarianism, ageism, nationalism, and speciesism—cressans) and locate the ultimate course of that destruction (human extinction) and its diversion (the Ecological Revolution) in a rational reconstruction of human societies. The reconstruction is commenced by a new and different perception of the human body and of Earth.

The postmodern era, with its global economic, ecological, ethnic, and military threats of human disaster, can benefit from macroanthropological explanations and analyses. Contemporary times suggest that the social sciences might concentrate on the behaviors of the species. The biophobia hypotheseis permits for that concentration.

For almost twenty years, cultural anthropology has been drifting around and among other social sciences and humanities for the structures of its own identity. Reflexivity and self-examination have created no clear trajectory for cultural anthropology. Today history, cultural studies, literary criticism, development studies, and the continuous reformulations of colonial power dominate cultural anthropology. None of them shows us the future of cultural anthropology. At many universities the four-field approach has been almost abandoned, and where it does exist, the fields do not communicate well with one another. Cultural anthropology textbooks introduce students to very little that will be their course work in undergraduate and graduate curricula and even to less that will encumber their lives in the global village. I assume t n hat undergraduate and graduate courses will change in the immediate future to reflect postcolonial cultural anthropology.

If the preset situation of cultural anthropology continues, it, as a major field in anthropology, may cease to exist in the academy. But it need not continue. Macroanthropology waits in the wings. Macroanthropology asserts that the exploration of diversity is not an anthropological end but merely a means to search for ourselves as a species. One goal of cultural anthropology is to understand and explain the species. The history and development of the discipline document that. The exploration of diversity is useful only as long as it helps along that way. In fact, that exploration taken too far becomes exploitive for the human propensity to produce and reproduce social inferiority. Macroanthropology is designed to understand and explain the species as well as to be contemporary and future oriented. It recognizes that the human species has no future unless it solves some of its major problems on Earth, and macroanthropology can help by exposing the human dimensions of those problems. It is no longer enough to describe and explain the wide array of human behaviors. We must learn why humans are threatened with global suicide. Such knowledge may allow some social transformations that alter the courses that humans now steer.

Anthropology began as a search for *Homo sapiens* and human nature. Such a broad quest has taken its practitioners in many directions. Some of those directions have been found faulty, but we continue the search.

Macroanthropology proposes to return to the roots, to recapture the vision of our ancestors. It proposes to ask research questions about the species, about human nature, about “the human dilemma” (e.g., population, poverty, and pollution). Macroanthropology will design its questions such that each of the five fields of anthropology can make a contribution. I provide an example below when I ask, what about the body?

In my example I suggest that many of the problems of the species are a result of our conceptions of our bodies, but each of the five fields of anthropology can easily grapple with the question. In a research team, each of the participants can decide its own focus. The objectives of all of the perspectives are to determine where anthropologists can work to contribute to the question.

Biological anthropology has been working with the body since it began, but I propose a broader perspective for it and “scientific” anthropology. What I envision is a perspective that tackles human insecurity about the body and its function; a perspective that examines health, well-being, and longevity; a perspective that might transform all previous perspectives.

Humanistic approaches to the body are popular and are reflected in the literature, but I would nudge them to include some attention to the body’s relation to self-esteem; on language and the failures of communication; on language and human divisiveness; and on language and a support system for the animal functions of humans.

Scientific anthropology can explain why and how humans abuse their bodies. How did such devaluation begin and why does it continue? How are such devaluations distributed in the world’s population and how do they vary among them? These concerns about the body will translate into concerns about Earth (practice), violence, and human divisiveness.

There are many ways to approach this task. The present suggestions are but examples. The human quest (often appearing irrational) for power, and the exploitation and misappropriation of natural and human resources in that quest, are beacons for us to search for human nature. Power seems a pervasive human addiction, and the exploitation of resources support the habit. Power has always required the exploitation and often misappropriation of Earth’s resources and still does. The global transformations in technology, communications, transportation, weapons systems, and commerce are all being diverted to the quest for power in a world in which natural resources are limited. The global waste of those resources for power is symptomatic of a species gone amuck.

Humans have always had each other to exploit and abuse for power and comparisons; we continue today (e.g. cressans). But the postmodern demand for natural resources has reached an apex. This book discusses that demand as a pervasive symbol and substance that has an external impact on human affairs. I examine the human quest for power and comparison that appears to be a crucial component of human history and human nature. The human drive to be superior can be humbling in its display of a lack of self-respect and self-control. Materials for an economy and polity, the means and structure for earning a livelihood, and culture-nature relations, all have implications for power. Material and charismatic bases for power are mutually reinforcing.

The Gouro elders’ power, for example, rests on the control of objects, people, and the symbolically separate market and prestige spheres of exchange. Power is, therefore, encoded in symbols, enacted in relationships, and grounded in things. (Dimen-Schein 1977:211)

The relationship in production, distribution, and consumption reveal some basic power relationships in a culture. Contrary to Marx, the means of production is only one conduit of power. There are others: types of games, social relations, marriage, and natural resources.

Power, then, exists in different domains within each culture. It has material, psychological, and social dimensions, and its constitution varies accordingly: strength in rape, tools in production, “pull” in getting a job, charisma in group leadership, decision making in politics, or the manipulation of myth in propaganda. Its psychosocial dimensions include awe and noblesse oblige, respect and contempt, sadomasochistic relationships, among others. Its behavioral expressions vary. (Dimen-Schein 1977:211)

Together natural resources and power constitute here the deep ecological discussion that describe a course for humankind. Much of the discussion focuses on how natural resources and power produce and reproduce social inferiority in “others,” and how that production and reproduction are driven by an abiding inferiority complex in humans. The biophobia hypothesis attempts to explain this phenomenon. Most scholarship has been prey to it. Decades of research on social stratification, race and ethnicity, gender, sectarianism, age discrimination, nationalism, and speciesism do not address the human vulnerability to the eternal social divisiveness that threatens to destroy our Earth or at least our species. I postulate from discovering the fundamental basis for this abiding social divisiveness. On the contrary, scholars have taken a perverted kind of pleasure, like the “dirty old man” who spends a lifetime of well-funded research on pornography, lecherously studying “classography, raceography, ethnography, feminography, sectography, gerontography, poverography, poorography, victimography,” inferior nations and species. This book is not about blame. It asks why humans must produce and reproduce social inferiority in order to exploit it, even by perennially studying it. The biophobia hypothesis says that it is because humans have a phobia about their animal biology that creates an inferiority complex in them.
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In this sense **imperceptible politics does not necessarily differ from or oppose other prevalent forms of politics, such as state-oriented politics, micropolitics, identity politics, cultural and gender politics, civil rights movements, etc**. And indeed **imperceptible politics connects with all these various forms of political engagement and intervention in an opportunistic way: it deploys them to the extent that they allow the establishment of spaces outside representation**; that is, spaces which do not primarily focus on the transformation of the conditions of the double-R axiom (rights and representation) but on the insertion of new social forces into a given political terrain. In the previous chapter we called this form of politics outside politics: the politics which opposes the representational regime of policing. Imperceptibility is the everyday strategy which allows us to move and to act below the overcoding regime of representation. **This everyday strategy is inherently anti-theoretical; that is, it resists any ultimate theorisation, it cannot be reduced to one successful and necessary form of politics** (such as state-oriented politics or micropolitics, for example). **Rather, imperceptible politics is genuinely empiricist, that is it is always enacted as ad hoc practices which allow the decomposition of the representational strategies in a particular field and the composition of events which cannot be left unanswered by the existing regime of control. If imperceptible politics resists theorisation and is ultimately empiricist, what then are the criteria for doing imperceptible politics? There are** three **dimensions which characterise imperceptible politics: objectlessness,** totality, **trust**. **Firstly, imperceptible politics is objectless, that is it performs political transformation without primarily targeting a specific political aim (such as transformation of a law or institution, or a particular claim for inclusion**, etc). **Instead imperceptible politics proceeds by materialising its own political actions through contagious and affective transformations.** **The object of its political practice is its own practices. In this sense, imperceptible politics is non-intentional - and therein lies its difference from state-oriented politics or the politics of civil rights movements**, for example - **it instigates change through a series of everyday transformations which can only be codified as having a central political aim or function in retrospect**. Secondly, imperceptible politics addresses the totality of an existing field of power. This seems to be the difference between imperceptible politics and micropolitics or other alternative social movements: imperceptible politics is not concerned with containing itself to a molecular level of action; it addresses the totality of power through the social changes which it puts to work in a particular field of action. The distinction between molar and molecular (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 275) has only analytical significance from the perspective of imperceptible politics. In fact imperceptible politics is both molar and molecular, because by being local situated action it addresses the whole order of control in a certain field. Imperceptible politics is located at the heart of a field of power and at the same time it opens a way to move outside this field by forcing the transformation of all these elements which are constitutive of this field. In this sense, imperceptible politics is a driving force which is simul­taneously both present and absent. We described this in the previous chapter by exploring the importance of speculative figurations for the practice of escape. On the everyday level of escape (a level we called in this chapter imperceptible politics) speculative figuration can be translated into trust. This is the third characteristic of **imperceptible politics**; it **is driven by a firm belief in the importance and truthfulness of its actions, without seeking any evidence for, or conducting any investigation into its practices. This is trust. Imperceptible politics is driven by trust in something which seems to be absent from a particular situation. Imperceptible politics operates around a void, and it is exactly the conversion of this void into everyday politics that becomes the vital force for imperceptible politics.**
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